

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 27, 2006 LR 259

statements first. I think the university would have gotten their \$2 million. I think they could have gone through the grant process. I'll also tell you that we spend a lot of money on healthcare and education in this state. Our natural resources and our environmental issues don't get much money, and so for those of us who are concerned about these issues, this is a little pittance that we get, and I think it's been well spent. Hats off to the Environmental Trust and their board. As Senator Wehrbein said, there's over 100 people who have requests in there for grants from the Environmental Trust Board, and I've liked the projects that I've seen in my area of the state. I don't consider them anti-agricultural projects. So I'm going to let Senator Beutler have a little time. I know that Senator Janssen and Senator Redfield and Senator Kremer are some of those that had some time. If they would like to say anything, just let me know. Senator Beutler, you can have some time.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Thank you, Senator Schrock, and I hope we can discuss this at a little more length, because we're way off base here, in terms of how this is being viewed by some of the speakers, in my opinion. Let me remind you again that back in 1993, in the spring of 1993, we did two things: We put a constitutional amendment on the ballot--this one that is before you today--and we passed a set of statutes that put into place the entire framework that we were asking the people to approve, so that the people of the state not only saw the language of the constitutional amendment, but they saw the whole grant process, they saw the whole thing laid out, and they knew about it because it was highly publicized, and that's what we voted on...that's what they voted on in November, and that's what they expected us to do. And that's what we did. In fact, we were careful about it. We even that following January went back and repassed the whole statutory framework so that it came after the constitutional amendment. Now this is why we get ourselves in trouble with the people, because we lay out this elaborate framework, we say this is what we're going to do, and then, by golly, we turn around and use it as a cash reserve fund for three years running. Then in a good year, when we don't even need it as a cash reserve fund, we use it one more time. The